


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: : Box: AF
Applicant: Eric BENAZZI et al : Group Art Unit: 1755
Serial No.: 09/103,528 : Examine: D. Sample
Filed: June 24, 1998 :
For: EU-1 ZEOLITE CATALYST AND A PROCESS FOR IMPROVING THE
POUR POINT FEEDS CONTAINING PARAFFINS



GAU 1755
#12
12/3/99
P. Jean

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action mailed August 27, 1999, please consider the remarks
that follow.

RECEIVED
12/2/99
1C 1100 MAIL ROOM

O.K. To Enter
12/5/99

REMARKS

The only issues outstanding in the Office Action mailed August 27, 1999, are the
rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103. The examiner is thanked for indicating the
withdrawal of other rejections, at page 2 of the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

At the outset, it is submitted that the principal reason that the examiner has
maintained the rejection is his failure to find the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132
submitted with the previous response probative. The examiner's failure to find the
Declaration probative is the result of a typographical error in the Declaration. In
particular, although it is argued in the Office Action that the silicon/aluminum ratios are not
comparable in the example according to the invention the comparative example, in fact, the
Declaration incorrectly indicates the ratio of catalyst C'4, the comparative catalyst, as being